



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/384,443	08/27/1999	BRENDAN P. MURRAY	52817.000090	7839

29315 7590 11/05/2002

MINTZ LEVIN COHN FERRIS GLOVSKY AND POPEO PC
12010 SUNSET HILL ROAD
SUITE 900
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

EDOUARD, PATRICK NESTOR

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2654

DATE MAILED: 11/05/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AG

Office Action Summary

Application No.
09/384,443

Applicant(s)
MURRAY ET AL

Examiner
PATRICK N. EDOUARD

Art Unit
2654



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 22, 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-6, 8-11, 13-16, and 18-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). 7-9, 11 6) ☐ Other:

Art Unit: 2654

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to communication filed 1/23/02 and 8/20/02 (papers # 9 and 10). Claims 1, 3-8, 10-15, 17-20 are pending. Claims 2, 7 12 and 17 are canceled.

Double Patenting

2. Claims 1, 3-6, 8-9, 11, 13-16 and 18-20 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims of copending Application No. 09/384,371 (as set forth in prior office action).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 5-6, 10-11, 15-16 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino et al (5,548,507) in view of Powell (6,157,905)

Art Unit: 2654

As per claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, Martino et al teach a method of evaluating characters in a message, comprising the steps of

“Accepting an input of the characters of the message” (figure 1, his document source 101, col. 7, lines 59-64); and

“Evaluating the message by comparing the characters of the message to a predetermined set of candidate character sets and the message” (figure 1, his word comparator controls 103, col. 9 and 10).

It is noted that Martino teaches “evaluating the message by comparing the words of the message to a predetermined set of candidate word sets to determine a match between the predetermined set of candidate word set and the message” (figure 1, his word comparator controls, col. 7, lines 59-67 through col. 8, lines 1-60, col. 5, lines 5-60), but does not explicitly teach comparing each character of the message to an entry for each of the candidate character sets in a character table bank. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Powell who teaches a facility for identifying the unknown language of text represented by a series of data values in accordance with a character set associates character glyphs with particular data values in the abstract and further teaches in col. 8 a table bank where each character in the example “snow called powder” is compared to each entry in the table. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to recognize that the language identification’s system of Martino using words could done using comparison of individual characters in a table bank as taught by Powell because it would provide

Art Unit: 2654

a system that would have a reasonable storage requirement and would be extensible to new character sets and languages with significant utility.

As per claims 5, 10, 15, and 20, Martino et al teach computing a total number of character matched to each of the candidate character sets (table 1, his cumulative frequency- see Powell col. 8, line 30- col. 10, line 56).

5. Claims 3-4, 8-9, 13-14 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martino et al (5,548,507) in view of Powell (6,157,905) as applied to claims 1, 8, 15, and 22 above and further in view of Edberg (5,873,111)

As per claims 3, 8, and 13 the combination (Martino et al with Powell) teaches the claimed invention but does not explicitly teach each character comprises the steps of testing the ability of each candidate character set to express that character by performing a logical mask between a universal code for that character and an indicator in the character table bank indicating whether each of the candidate character sets contain that character. However, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Edberg who teach at col. 6, lines 30-47, a collocation object within an object database with collocation information organized in a table in such a way as to facilitate a selection of an intersection of a character attribute in the table with any other character attribute in the table. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to incorporate into the combination (Martino with Powell) the

Art Unit: 2654

collocation object and table as taught by Edberg because Edberg teaches one of ordinary skill in the art the benefit of using a collocation object and table with the motivation of providing portability , improving performance, ability to handle unicode and improving linguistic capability.

As per claims 4, 9, 14 and 19 Edberg teaches the universal code is unicode (figure 7).

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry) Or:

Art Unit: 2654

(703) 305-9508 (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA.,

Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patrick N. Edouard whose telephone number is (703) 308-6725. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 07:30 a.m.-6:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold, can be reached on (703) 305-4379.

The facsimile phone number for this Art Unit is (703) 872-9314. Alternatively, facsimile messages may be sent directly to (703) 305-9644 where they will be stored in the examiner's voice mailbox (telling the examiner that a fax was received) and be automatically printed (i.e. - no delay by the examiner).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Patrick N. Edouard

October 30, 2002



PATRICK N. EDOUARD
PATENT EXAMINER